UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/665,668	09/20/2000	Larry B. Gray	JJI-49	5527	
	7590 12/03/200 nporcero, Jr., Esq.	EXAMINER			
Johnson & John	ison	BUI, VY Q			
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3773		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/03/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/665,668	GRAY ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Vv Q. Bui	3773		

	vy Q. Bui	3773	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 23 November 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in comp	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	•	ΓE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in beti appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying the	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finding reje	otod olamio.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mnliant Amendment (PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		impliant / imonament (1 102 024).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	owasie ii ousiiiittod iii a ooparate, i	annery med anneriamen	it canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected to:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached before attached by See Continuation Sheet. 		i condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	r 1 0/30/00) raper NO(\$)		
	/Vy Q. Bui/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3773	
	<i>,</i> =,		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the Applicant (Remarks/Arguments, page 3, paper 11/23/2009) argued that Kleshinski-5,746,765 (F 2-5 and 13) does not disclose "a wave" as in claim 21 or "wave-shaped struts" as in claim 22. To the contrary, the "Board of Appeal" (Decision on Appeal, paper 1/19/2007) has found that F 2-5 of Simon-5,354,308, which are the same as F 2-5 of Kleshinski-5,746,765 (Simon-5,354,308 is a parent case of Kleshinski-'765), disclose a stent including "wave-shaped" struts (paper 1/19/2007; page 7: lines 1-20, and page 8: last paragraph) and a greater frequency at the end of the stent shown in F 4 of Simon-5,354,308 (or F 4 of Leshinski-'765).

The Applicant (Remarks/Arguments, page 3, paper 11/23/2009) also argued that Kleshinski-'765 does not disclose "serpentine" shape. However, the "Board of Appeal" (Decision on Appeal, paper 1/19/2007) has found that the stent of the current invention includes a wave shape or serpentine shape including curved sections and straight sections (the "Board of Appeal": Decision on Appeal, paper 1/19/2007, page 5, lines 13-16). As indicated in the "Final Office Action" (9/30/2009), the stent of Kleshinski-'765 (F 2-5 and 13) does include curved sections (bent around circular pin 50, see F 13 of Kleshinski-'765) and straight sections between curved section bent around pin 50, therefore, Kleshinski-'765 stent also includes wave-shaped struts or serpentine-shaped strut.

As to the rejection 103(a), Klein-5,593,442 clearly teaches a stent including a wire bent in a "serpentine" shape. The serpentine shape as taught by Klein-'442 defines a general zig-zag shape with straight portions. In view of Klein-'442, it would have been obvious to one of ordianry skill in the art to recognize that the struts of Kleshinski-'765 are also recognized as "serpentine-shaped".